

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
THE LODGE AT TONTO NATURAL BRIDGE STATE PARK
PAYSON, AZ
JULY 17, 2003
MINUTES**

Board Members present:

Suzanne Pfister, Chairman
John Hays
Elizabeth Stewart
William Porter
William Cordasco

Board Members absent:

Gabriel Gonzales-Beechum
Mark Winkleman

Staff present:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administrative Services
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs
James Garrison, State Historic Preservation Officer
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary
Janet Hawks, Chief of Operations
Andrea Madonna, Chief of Grants
John Boeck, Park Manager, Tonto Natural Bridge State Park
Keith Ayotte, Central Region Manager
Elizabeth Krug, Research and Marketing

Attorney General's Representative:

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chairman Pfister called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Roll Call of Board Members indicated a quorum was present.

B. INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS AND AGENCY STAFF

Chairman Pfister noted that the same people were present as were present yesterday and dispensed with introductions.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Pfister noted she had received no requests from the public to address the Board at this time. She then moved to Agenda Item I, Executive Session.

I. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Hays made a motion to go into Executive Session. Mr. Porter seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The Parks Board went into Executive Session at 9:05 a.m.

Chairman Pfister reconvened the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Approve Minutes of May 15, 2003 State Parks Board Meeting.**
2. **Approve Executive Session Minutes of May 2003 State Parks Board Meeting**
3. **Consider Amending the Project to Add Scope Items Without Increasing Funding for LRSP Heritage Fund Project #650109 – Rotary Park Soccer Field Improvements** – Staff recommends amending the scope of LRSP Heritage Fund Project #650109 – Rotary Park Soccer Field Improvements – by adding a restroom, ramadas, and a shade cover for the bleachers. The Arizona Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Commission (AORRC) unanimously concurred with this recommendation on June 12, 2003.

Ms. Stewart requested Item 3 be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion.

Mr. Porter made a motion to approve items 1 and 2 of the Consent Agenda. Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Stewart requested more information on whether these items were part of the original proposal and an explanation on how it is the Board now has different items. She also asked what criteria and policies exist in the manual regarding adding to the approved project after its completion. These items do not appear to be substitute items. These are totally different items, even though they are complimentary to the project. She is not comfortable approving them until she has more information.

Chairman Pfister noted there was a fairly comprehensive letter that accompanied the request. She felt comfortable that, as they got into the project, they had additional changes and felt they could upgrade the amenities. She felt that was covered in the letter submitted by Bullhead City.

Ms. Stewart responded that she understood the city's position. She is not sure what the policy manual on grants says and what was done when similar situations arose in the past. She want to know what kind of precedent the Board might set by approving items that are totally different from what was originally in the grant request.

Ms. Madonna responded that the Board has approved amendments like this in the past, especially when they finish under budget. They are not requesting an increase in the grant award. Generally speaking, they are requesting to use those funds within the same project. Approving this item would set no precedent.

Mr. Travous added that staff have administrative authority to approve anything within 10% of the original amount. Anything above 10% must come before the Board.

Mr. Porter stated that this request concerned him. He is not opposed to it; he is not concerned about precedent because the Board does not set precedents that are binding upon them. The Board has a right to take a look at each individual situation to make the right call. He is bothered by the monumental difference between what they proposed as the budget for their project and what they actually ended up spending. While it's commendable, it appears that they received a sudden input of money from additional sources. There has to be a reason why a project that they originally estimated and approved a budget for \$150,000 ended up at \$36,500. His concern is

whether there was anything deliberate where a chance was seen to expand upon an approved project.

Mr. Travous responded that he believes that is why a 10% ceiling for administrative approval was put in place. This is unusual. It is not unusual for the recipients to come in again to be sure they have everything covered. It is not unusual to make large savings in this type of project. It is unusual for everything to happen at once. The applicant knows that if there is more than a 10% difference their project will receive a second look by the Board. They could lose the money, too.

Board Action

Mr. Hays: I move to amend the scope of LRSP Heritage Fund Project #650109 – Rotary Park Soccer Field Improvements – by adding a restroom, ramadas, and a shade cover for the bleachers.

Mr. Cordasco seconded the motion.

Mr. Porter stated his intention to abstain from the vote due to a possible conflict of interest. He noted he was District Governor of the Rotary when Rotary Park was established and he does have a very solid, strong emotional tie to that park. He also took part in fund raising for the park at one time.

Chairman Pfister called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried with four Ayes and one abstention.

Chairman Pfister then moved to Item G on the Agenda in order to accommodate citizens who wished to address the Board on this issue.

G. PARTNERSHIPS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

- 1. Section Report** – City of Peoria Request for Reconsideration of Parks Board Action to Postpone Funding Decision for the 75th Avenue and Greenway Park Project

Chairman Pfister requested that staff report on this issue, followed by the representative from the City of Peoria.

Ms. Madonna reported that the City of Peoria has requested an executive review of the Board's decision of May 15 to postpone a funding decision on a project that came in during the 2003 LRSP funding grant cycle. In that grant cycle, there was a 20% cap per entity for receiving grant funds. Therefore, up to 20% of the new revenue amount from the Heritage Fund was available to any one entity. This was the second project submitted by the City of Peoria, and exceeded the cap for Heritage Fund money. When LRSP money became available, staff recommended that the Board fund this project through that grant program. Because of the low scores, the Board decided to add the unfunded projects to the 2003 LRSP grant cycle. A representative of the City of Peoria is present to request that the Board award the LRSP money for this project.

Chairman Pfister noted this is the 75th Avenue and Greenway Park Project that, when it was resubmitted, improved its score from 50 to 63.5. She asked for staff's recommendation on this request.

Ms. Madonna responded that staff stood by its previous recommendation to fund this project.

Ms. Stewart noted that when staff recommended that that project be funded in May, they also recommended that the Board fund three other grant requests. The Board's decision was to defer consideration of all of those projects and consider them along with the other applicants to see if others may have higher scores. The Board was concerned about their responsibility to the stewardship of public money and to ensure the funding was going to those projects that scored high. The reason these four projects had increased scores is because staff assisted them in resubmitting their grant applications. Even with those new scores, the applicants are still below the cut-off.

Ms. Madonna responded that the cut-off is for Heritage Fund grants. There is no cut-off for LWCF grants.

Ms. Stewart stated that she feels that just because this money comes from a different source, the standards should not be any lower.

Chairman Pfister noted that the standards for this grant program is not in the policy that way.

Ms. Stewart responded that she understood that, but, being responsible for public money, she feels that this money should not be thrown away simply because is from the federal government rather than Heritage Fund.

Chairman Pfister noted there was one individual who wished to address the Parks Board on this issue.

Mr. J. P. de la Montaigne, Community Services Director, City of Peoria, addressed the Board. He stated his understanding that their project originally was not funded last September only because of the cap on the Heritage Fund. He referred to the 2002 LRSP Grant Project Funding Recommendations that was presented to the Board last September. He noted that they did score enough points to meet the criteria had there not been a cap in place on the Heritage Funds. It was his understanding that when the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) money did become available, this project had enough points to apply.

Mr. de la Montaigne noted that in September the Board funded a project that scored lower than their project even before the recalculation. Staff assisted them in rewriting their application because their project was not funded with others that did not meet the criteria.

Mr. de la Montaigne stated his belief that had there not been a cap, the Board would have been funded their project in the September Parks Board meeting. It was more an issue of the cap that was in place rather than their score, in his perspective.

Chairman Pfister stated that she believed the last statement to be correct.

Ms. Stewart stated that her recollection was that some Board members had raised serious concerns at that meeting about awarding the grants at that time to applicants at that low of a score. She believes some of the Board members also raised some concern about the fact that those were Heritage Funds and they had passed a policy of having a certain percentage above the scores. They had received information at that time that

there may have been some difficulty with the applicants. That was why further information was requested.

Ms. Stewart added that her feeling in May, as it today, was that if forced to decide on this and the other grants that were presented she would vote No rather than approving them without seeing what else is being submitted. She feels this is a large amount of money. Times have changed since last September. She believes that the Board now know that in the future their funds will be more limited than in the past several years. She feels the Board has a duty to the public to carefully scrutinize all agreements and to award them to the very highest. That is not to say that these that received lower scores are not worthy. She just believes the Board has an obligation and that a two-month delay is not that much. She is concerned about going ahead with this applicant and not the other three.

Mr. Hays asked if Ms. Stewart was suggesting waiting to see what comes in rather than suggesting not funding this project.

Ms. Stewart responded affirmatively. That is what the Board's decision was in May and she feels that the Board should stick with its decision. She doesn't see any reason to take this applicant out and separate it from the others that applied. She sympathizes with the fact Peoria would like to know where they stand and that they would like to go forward and that they feel that they would have gotten funding back in September but for the cap. This is a large sum of money. Considering what the Board may have in the future, it may very well turn out that this is one of the higher scoring applicants in September. If that's the case, she has no problem awarding them the money. She feels the Board has an obligation to wait.

Chairman Pfister stated that there is also a level of fairness of what this project was competing with. Mr. de la Montaigne is correct that the Board would have funded this project but for the cap. This project is above the line. The Board is not being fair in the reverse in the sense that the Board did fund a lower project. The Board is being inconsistent in its application. She feels very uncomfortable with that. She respectfully disagrees with Ms. Stewart and does believe the Board should fund this project. If there were a motion to fund, she would vote Yes.

Mr. de la Montaigne stated that was his follow-up point. The Board funded a project below their score. He went to Washington in February and met with the Arizona delegation in support of the LWCF. One of their concerns was getting those funds to the state and getting them to the projects as soon as possible. At that time he believed their project was the first in line and he told them their project was ready to go and would meet those needs.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the Board had to award the entire amount requested.

Chairman Pfister explained that the City of Peoria completed an application that showed their need in order to complete the project. The Board has funded less when there was not sufficient money available. Usually that is done because of lack of funds available and a desire to give a little funding to others.

Mr. Cordasco asked how much the project was that was below their score and was funded.

Chairman Pfister responded that project was for \$137,996 and was the Coconino county Peaks View County Park Phase II.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the Board has the option to adjust the amount and then review it again in September for the remaining balance.

Ms. Madonna responded the Board could partially fund the grant. It would require two different agreements.

Mr. Ziemann noted that sometimes creates more problems for everyone, and especially for Peoria. They then don't know whether they have a project to go forward with or not.

Mr. Travous added that these are matching funds. Whatever the Board gives them, the City must match dollar-for-dollar.

Mr. de la Montaigne stated the City of has \$500,000 in matching funds for this project.

Board Action

Ms. Stewart: I move that the Parks Board defer consideration of this project until there is further information available on the other grants as decided in May and that the Board consider this applicant along with the Lake Havasu City, St. Johns, and the Globe projects.

Mr. Porter seconded the motion. The motion carried with Chairman Pfister voting Nay.

Mr. de la Montaigne asked if, since the other grant applications have already been submitted, their project will now be compared with those new projects.

Ms. Stewart responded that those new projects did not have the benefit of having staff assist them in raising their scores. She believes Peoria actually has an advantage.

Mr. de la Montaigne asked, if their point score is so low that the Board does not fund it now, how will it be considered in September.

Ms. Stewart responded that that was not what she said. Her point was that in May the Board decided, because of a limited amount of money available in the future and its concern that these scores were fairly low, they want to see what else comes in. It may very well be that the other applicants come in with even lower scores because they did not have assistance from staff to raise their scores by 13 points. Actually, in her opinion, Peoria is going into this at an advantage.

Chairman Pfister offered to have staff discuss this more with Peoria in terms of the logistics.

E. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. View video "Making Sense of Place"

Chairman Pfister stated that viewing the video will be moved to the end of the meeting.

2. Review Policy of No State Parks in Maricopa or Pima Counties

Mr. Travous reported that the Board has a policy that states that as long as Maricopa and Pima Counties have viable recreational programs Arizona State Parks (ASP) will not operate state parks in those two counties. There are a few reasons for that policy.

First, the agency was not seeking any parks in those two counties when the policy was instituted. It happened at a particular time when Maricopa County was trying to negotiate a long-term lease with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) for the management of Lake Pleasant. They tried to renegotiate their tenure there over a two-year period. The BOR kept going back to them and saying that they did not need to deal with the County, they would just deal with ASP and cut the County out. While ASP had no knowledge of that it was being thrown into the mix, and the County felt that they were in a bad negotiating position to manage Lake Pleasant. At that point in time, in order to make it clear to the County that ASP was not interested in adding Lake Pleasant to the park system, the Parks Board made a policy that ASP would not look for recreational parks in Maricopa and Pima Counties.

Mr. Travous noted that, geopolitically, Arizona has become more urban-oriented. As the political clout in the state legislature migrates towards the urban centers where ASP has no parks, the agency continues to lose affinity with the people who cast the votes in the state legislature. Even 15 years ago there was enough trade-off that if people in Maricopa and Pima Counties wanted to get something there was enough "horse trading" with legislators in the rural counties to get things done. He doesn't see that happening nearly as much any more. This is one negative aspect of that policy.

Mr. Travous stated that one of the positive effects of that policy is that there have been some unwanted projects offered and the Board could cite this policy.

Chairman Pfister stated she brought this issue up because she has been approached on a couple of projects. It is her sense that the Parks Board serves the entire state of Arizona. The agency's mission is to provide cultural and recreational resources and benefits to the entire State of Arizona. Yet, in effect, the Board is not serving the two largest counties in the state. There is a state park (Catalina State Park) in Pima County. It seems odd to her that the Board provides no services in the largest county in the state (Maricopa). The long-term vision meeting may be a good time to discuss this issue. She believes the reasons to create this policy might have been valid at the time it was passed, but she doesn't see Maricopa County aggressively going out and looking at parks for Maricopa County residents. Not that the Board needs to add more parks, but she would like the Board to not be stuck in a vision that does not allow for providing services or recreational and cultural amenities to the two largest counties in the state.

Mr. Porter asked if the policy states just no recreational parks or no parks period.

Mr. Travous responded that it provides for no parks.

Mr. Porter stated his agreement with the Chairman. He believes the Board are tying their hands unnecessarily. He also does not think this is a decision the Board would want to make peremptorily. He believes it is an excellent idea to put this discussion on the Agenda for the long-range discussion. It really is a philosophical issue. The Board does put itself at a disadvantage with key legislators who quite frankly don't care what happens outside the boundary of Maricopa County. Because the Board has absolutely nothing that impacts their bailiwick it has absolutely no credibility or standing with them. He believes it's a good idea.

Mr. Hays stated he would rather not change the policy. The Board is the last bit of leverage to distribute some capital investment outside of the two most powerful counties. He would not like to see that change.

Ms. Stewart stated she has a different take on this issue. She looks at it from two standpoints. One, over the past 10 years the Board's view of what a state park is has changed somewhat. There are some natural areas now. She believes the kinds of opportunities that people want have shifted some. Core things are still core things. However, there are other things that people want. The legislative issue isn't as compelling to her one way or the other as is the fact that the Board has a park system. If there is some presence in Maricopa County, it introduces more of the population to the fact that the agency has some wonderful things to offer them – whether it be cultural, recreational, or in the environmental education area. This will introduce people to what ASP does and may lead them to check out some of the other parks. She thinks that were it not for the policy the Board could consider things on their own merit – how they fit into the total system, adding something that doesn't exist, etc. She doesn't know that she would just want to necessarily have something in Maricopa County just to have it in Maricopa County. But she doesn't think that should be the deciding factor. She feels the Board couldn't help but consider that as a factor if they were considering a park either in Maricopa or Pima Counties because it is an issue. She doesn't believe it is something the Board would just out-of-hand not consider.

Mr. Porter stated he does not disagree with what either is saying. He recognizes the validity of Mr. Hays' counterpoint. He still believes there is an issue regarding what Ms. Stewart had said. He is not saying parks should be established just to impress the legislators in Maricopa County. If something comes up that is appropriate, he believes that the standards being applied for establishment of a park by Maricopa are very different from what the Board would look at. He believes the Board would be much more inclined to establish historic parks in Maricopa in areas the County would not really be interested in. ASP may have a bigger overall picture. He believes this is something the Board should take a good hard look at. He believes the Board are tying their hands and perhaps they should not be doing that. It may not be a good thing if a legislator, for example, asks why there are no state parks in Maricopa County and the answer to that question is primarily because of an established policy.

Mr. Hays noted that the Executive Director and the Board were very involved in the Spur Cross acquisition inside Maricopa County. ASP does not own it. He asked how the policy was handled in that case.

Mr. Travous responded that staff acted as a negotiator and contributed LWCF money but ASP does not own the keys to the property.

Mr. Hays stated he felt the deal was very well done despite of all the trials and tribulations. He doesn't know whether staff are considering the Tovar Mansion.

Mr. Travous responded that, from his perspective, that would be a downside in going in Carte Blanc and having places that are given without additional funds or places that don't have a compelling story. If the only criteria were political clout, it would be bad for the park system. In politics, that's OK.

Mr. Travous added that he believes it is intriguing that the Director of the National Parks Service (NPS) introduced himself once as the Director of NPS, the man who mows your lawn.

Chairman Pfister suggested adding this issue to the vision-planning meeting. It would be worth discussing what the implications would be. Regarding Spur Cross, just what

the Board went through during the last legislative session (the legislature thought they could cut a deal to sell the Board's conservation easements to the County) makes her all the more queasy. While it didn't go very far, if the Board had a more compelling interest it never even would have come up.

Ms. Stewart noted that the County's focus is a lot narrower than the Board's. The Board has an interest in archaeological and historical things that the County is not interested in. She doesn't know that the legislature is going to be as interested in pushing off something on the Board now since there seems to be a greater appreciation of the agency's operations problems. It may be that times have changed in a lot of areas.

Mr. Ziemann added that a bill appears almost every legislative session to make something (i.e., Barry Goldwater's home) into a state park. If it is not a bill, a discussion still comes up. The policy has helped to flush some of this. He doesn't just tell people about the policy; he tells people that there is a very viable park system in Maricopa County. There are very viable, professional, well-funded people running the park system in Pima County. That may be where some of these places should go rather than the state park system. However, the policy does tie the Board's hands.

3. Agency Communications

Mr. Travous referred to a handout that consisted of a series of graphs. In May there were discussions about communications within the agency. In his last newsletter, *In The Loop*, he included a request to hear back from every employee that a) they got it, b) the position they held within the organization, and c) what park or section they work in.

Mr. Travous reported that the percentage of people who responded fell according to their distance from his office. Executive Staff had a 50% response on the first day and a 100% response rate by the seventh day of receipt. Office personnel had a response rate of 32% by the eighth day. Regional Staff had a response rate of 60% by the seventh day. Park Managers had a 30% response rate by the seventh day. Assistant Park Managers had a response rate of 10% by the fourth day and stayed at about that rate through the seventh day. It is about the same for the field staff. He received one response from a volunteer.

Mr. Travous reported that the question was asked as to why employees did not respond. One answer was that a large number of people in the Phoenix Office thought the request was meant for the field staff. The response from the field was that they simply put off responding and never got around to it. While there is a computer in every park, it is generally the Park Manager and the Assistant Park Manager who have access. Another response was that the parks staff believed that since the newsletter was posted one response from the park counted for everyone. The problem with that was that there was not feedback that everyone at the parks had seen the newsletter.

Mr. Travous stated that the assumption is that a lot more people saw the newsletter but did not respond for a variety of reasons. Unfortunately, there is no way to track it. A request has been made to the Park Managers that during their regular staff meetings they review the newsletters. It may also be possible that approved Minutes of the Board meetings could be printed out at each park and placed in a central location for staff to review if they wish.

Mr. Travous added that a discussion will take place at next week's Park Managers meeting regarding the importance of communication. If Executive Staff cannot determine how to best communicate, then the problem cannot be effectively tackled. They need to understand that a lot of these things are in response to feedback from the employee survey. Executive Staff need feedback that the employees are getting the communications. There is a difference between, "We don't like the message" and, "We aren't getting the message". The first order of business is to ensure everyone is getting the message. Payroll stuffers don't work well because so many people use "direct deposit" now.

Ms. Stewart stated this information gives the Board an idea of whether or not people were getting information from the Executive Director. She asked what kind of system is in place where the concerns and issues are heard from the employees. It appeared that there was a problem with communication within the agency. Usually, when people feel that there is a problem of communication they are not so much feeling that they are not getting directions or information from someone else as they are feeling that they are not being heard or that if they are being heard, nothing is happening in response.

Mr. Travous responded that in that newsletter, as well as in previous newsletters, he asked them to send him information he should have, questions they might have, etc. He believes that message is getting out, but he's not getting a response.

Ms. Stewart suggested sending something out that indicates a number of employees expressed concern about communication and ask them how they would like communication to be handled.

Chairman Pfister suggested Executive Staff talk with the Park Managers, have them talk to their staff, and then try to get more feedback through another newsletter request. They may say E-mail is not the way to go and have other ideas for communication.

Mr. Travous responded that he suspected what staff really want is "face time". He and Mr. Ream attended a regional potluck at Havasu City recently; some of Executive Staff will attend the Park Manager's meeting next week; Project 11 meetings are conducted in the field; more than half of the Parks Board meetings are held in the field.

Mr. Porter requested that staff communicate to the Park Managers that this is something the Board has a tremendous concern about and interest in at this point. The Board has a profound suspicion that there is not good communication within the agency. It must be a two-way street. The Board has a number of concerns; the primary concern is that the Board wants the employees to feel there is a channel of communication open to them and that it's OK to communicate all the way up the chain. The Board is sincerely interested, especially in the current times as staff are taking hits and getting hurt (not only not receiving pay raises but getting zapped on their actual income), in having a good communication process in place so that the Board knows their thoughts. The Board needs input from them and are not comfortable with the current level of response from the employees. The Board is concerned that people are not getting the message and that it is not getting the feedback it feels it should be getting. The Park Managers need to understand that a significant part of their obligation as Park Managers is to take the steps they need to in order to open the lines of communication more. If they are receiving communications that should be going to the employees, they need to copy them and ensure they get out to the employees. They

need to get input from their staff at their periodic meetings that they, in turn, pass on up the chain. It perhaps needs to be one of the elements on which the Park Managers are rated ultimately. He believes it goes that far.

Mr. Travous stated that his biggest disappointment in the response was that only 30% of the Park Managers responded. He knows they all had access to computers. The response from the Phoenix Office staff was disappointing, as well.

Ms. Stewart stated that, having worked for a government agency, staff are inundated with a lot of stuff and intend to do something. They put it off in order to deal with other crises. The Board needs to be careful that this is not viewed as one more task for the employees.

Mr. Travous responded that one person's perspective was that the communication was a test set-up for him to fail.

Chairman Pfister stated that staff are doing the right thing. Staff are doing what the Board asked, and she commended staff for doing so. Staff will need to work through it to see what the best mix is.

Mr. Cordasco stated he would be thinking differently regarding his expectations. In his ranching experience, there may be a trading post in one area, a ranch in another area, something else in another area, etc., and then the central office area is somewhere else. The communication in the central area will be different from that in the outside. It takes time to build trust in the outer areas. Because the agency is decentralized, the approach to communication in the field should not be judged the same way as communication within the Phoenix Office.

Chairman Pfister added that this is only one tool. She agreed that face time is by far the best way to deal with the offsite areas. That's where the Board has heard the feedback.

Mr. Travous noted that staff have received feedback that they are reading the newsletter, they like it, and they do like the fact that the Board is getting out to the parks. Those things are working.

Chairman Pfister asked Mr. Boeck, Park Manager at Tonto Natural Bridge State Park (Tonto) if he had anything to add that would be of help to the Board.

Mr. Boeck responded that all employees at Tonto have access to this type of information. They initial it after they read it. The information is given to them to read; some just don't respond. The information really is getting read a lot more than the survey may show. The employees appreciate the information.

Chairman Pfister noted that it appears the communication going one way is working OK. The question is how to get response back.

Mr. Boeck responded that at Tonto there are four full-time employees and two temporary employees. Three full-time employees have E-mail access; the rest do not. He encourages them to write a note because it is more personal. He should not be typing their responses for them. While he encourages staff to respond, some just don't do so. The information is being received.

Ms. Hawks added that park staff are very happy when Board members and Executive Staff go out to the parks. She believes that anything that goes out in writing needs to be

kept simple. It is easy to forget is that park staff, particularly at Park Ranger II and volunteer levels, really don't know what is going on with the grants program or the issues facing Computer Support staff. They are really focused on serving the public at their parks, staffing issues at their parks, etc. When she is in the field she tries to not get into those other things. It's not that they don't care; it's just that other things are more meaningful to them. She encouraged the Board and Executive Staff, when in the field, to come at it from the parks staffs' perspective.

4. Organizational Overview

Mr. Travous stated this discussion is still anecdotal. This discussion is probably more appropriate for a planning meeting as discussed yesterday.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

- 1. Section report** – Questions and comments regarding the FY 2004, FY 2005, and FY 2006 Strategic Plan; Questions and comments regarding the FY 2004 (revised) and FY 2005 (revised) Operating Budgets; Questions and comments regarding the SHPO Workplan Task List.

Mr. Siegwarth noted there are a number of Board actions needed that refer to the information shared at the Board meeting held July 16. One additional Board action deals with the bidding process for a concession due to the upcoming expiration of an agreement.

2. Board actions needed:

- a. Approval of FY 2004, FY 2005 and FY 2006 Strategic Plan** – Staff recommends that the Board approve the Three-Year Strategic Plan for FYs 2004, 2005, and 2006 and that the Executive Director be authorized to carry out the programs as required.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Board approve the Three-Year Strategic Plan for FYs 2004, 2005, and 2006 as discussed on July 16 and that the Executive Director be authorized to carry out the programs as required.

Chairman Pfister noted there were some amendments to the Strategic Plan as presented yesterday.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that those amendments will be included in the revised document and that revised document will be provided to the Board.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- b. Approval of FY 2004 (revised) and FY 2005 (revised) Operating Budgets** – Staff recommends that the Board approve the FY 2004 (revised) and FY 2005 (revised) Operating Budgets as a lump-sum and that the Executive Director be authorized to implement the programs, including submittal to the Governor's Office and legislature as required.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Parks Board approve the FY 2004 (revised) and FY 2005 (revised) Operating Budgets as a lump-sum and that the Executive Director be

authorized to implement the programs, including submittal to the Governor's Office and legislature as required. Further, that the budget includes the approval to pay OHV reimbursable payment requests received by April 10, 2003 with grant suspensions otherwise continuing and to be decided at a fall Board meeting.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion.

Chairman Pfister explained that the agencies that were suspended would be notified that their reimbursements will be sent.

Ms. Stewart asked if there could be some communication sooner.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that staff will send out a notice that reimbursements will be processed for payment.

Mr. Ziemann added that E-mails were sent last week notifying them that the Board would be considering this.

Chairman Pfister requested staff send an E-mail notifying them of the Board's action.

Chairman Pfister called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried unanimously.

- c. **Approval of the FY 2004 SHPO Workplan Task List** – Staff recommends that the Board approve the FY 2004 SHPO work program task list.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Board approve the FY 2004 SHPO work program task list.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- d. **Concession Contract at Patagonia Lake State Park** – Staff recommends that the board authorize the Executive Director or his designee to enter into negotiations and a contract for concession services at Patagonia Lake State Park.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that that board authorize the Executive Director or his designee to enter into negotiations and a contract for concession services at Patagonia Lake State Park.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion.

Ms. Stewart requested information on what this motion encompasses and whether staff will try to improve the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Ream responded that this concession has gone from a "mom and pop" to a professional concessionaire. Staff will ask for proposals. Staff have some things they would like to see happen with this concessionaire. Whether or not they carry gift shop items remains to be seen. As higher-quality gift shop items are produced, it may be beneficial to sell them to the concessionaire.

Chairman Pfister noted that the goal is to get the best deal possible.

Mr. Ream agreed that the goal is to get the best deal possible and provide the best customer service possible. The concessionaire takes a big gamble, as does the agency, in that it may rain or, as is the case this year, it may not rain. Both of those scenarios have consequences. The lake is lower than usual, there are "Launch At Your Own Risk" signs up at the park. The concessionaire is losing money. However, the day use is up because of the heat. Everyone wants to come to swim. There are risks, and the agency must share some of that risk. That is why staff like the "tiered" plan. Up to a certain amount in sales, the agency gets perhaps 4%; when sales reach another amount, the agency would get 6%; etc.

Ms. Stewart asked if this would be an improvement in terms of percentage over the old contract. Some of the contracts currently in place were entered into years ago and have a very low percentage. She asked if this is one of those contracts that was low.

Mr. Ream responded that this was one of the agency's newer contracts. It was only a five-year agreement. Staff learned some things over those five years with this concessionaire and improvements have been made to the park since it was signed. There will be another expansion during the term of the new contract that will increase the size again thus increasing the customer base. Staff want to ensure that, as the park grows and improvements are made at Patagonia Lake State Park, as well as opening Sonoita Creek, the agency receives more from the concessionaire. They are taking a gamble in buying into ASP; they need to know ASP will improve the property and will want to grow along with them.

Chairman Pfister asked for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried unanimously.

G. PARTNERSHIPS AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

1. Section Report

Legislative Recap

Mr. Ziemann reported that, considering where things stood a year ago, things are looking good. He referred to a document included in the Board package entitled, "46th Legislature 1st Regular Session 2003 Bills". He noted that the agency has been continued for 10 years. Agency Reports will not be so bureaucratic. The Growing Smarter 10% program was moved to the Department of Agriculture (Ag), which made staff very happy. In general, the legislative session did not turn out too bad.

Ms. Stewart asked if the Board should concern be concerned about any of the bills that passed.

Mr. Ziemann responded most of these bills only affect the agency in positive ways. The budgets and line-items were discussed yesterday. The HCR that passed will go to the referendum. He believes these are all good things for the agency.

Mr. Porter asked if there is a reason, other than time constraints, why the tax write-off bill died. He asked if this is something that just will not fly because of dislike on the legislators' part or if it will receive more attention in a later session.

Mr. Ziemann responded that the tax write-off bill was ultimately killed the President of the Senate (Senator Bennett). In discussions with him, it appears that he did not have

any philosophical problems with the bill. In fact, he thought the bill was fine and supported it. It was killed in the process. He wanted it to go through as a striker added to another bill. By that point in the session there were so few bills left that there was no place to put it. He tried to get it removed from committee and moved directly to the floor. There was agreement from the committee chairs that that would be fine. Senator Bennett had become very frustrated with the budget process; he had a lot of big issues to worry about.

Chairman Pfister asked if staff would try to get this bill again next year.

Mr. Ziemann responded that it is worth trying again next year. He believes there will be every opportunity to get that bill through again.

Summary Report on the Statewide Historic Preservation Partnership Conference

Mr. Garrison reported that the Statewide Historic Preservation Partnership Conference was held June 26-28 in Chandler at the San Marcos Hotel. The conference began at 1:00 p.m. on the 26th and ended at noon on the 28th. The theme was "Sense of Place". A pre-conference workshop was held on the compliance process to engage the archaeologists and perhaps lure them to the workshop itself. As it turned out, there were probably more Certified Local Government (CLG) people at that pre-conference workshop.

Mr. Garrison distributed copies of some of the responses received on some of the tracks. The previous conference SHPO held was a CLG conference. Because it is very complicated and time-consuming to coordinate and produce a conference, a decision was made to hold a Partnership Conference. The Arizona Preservation Foundation was the first partner. It was agreed that the registration fees would go to the private/non-profit for food. The next partner was the Department of Commerce and Industry Program because of the affinity in historic preservation with the Department of Commerce. One of the messages of the conference was that historic preservation is economic development. A CLG track was also developed, as well as a Mainstreet track. The Arizona Preservation Foundation track was really about the recent past. On Saturday they had something for Arizona homeowners so they could come to learn about the tax advantages of their properties and proper techniques and technical matters dealing with homeowner preservation. There were 51 homeowners present.

Mr. Garrison noted 108 attended the CLG track. Staff considered the conference a success at 100 attendees. There were 54 speakers involved. The total number of people involved somehow in this conference was 348. Staff are talking about next year.

Mr. Garrison stated staff did everything possible to make this conference a success. Real-life examples were used where appropriate. The partners will meet in August to begin planning the next conference. Additional partners may become involved.

Mr. Garrison reported that the closing speaker was Mr. Don Riptima(?). He discussed how the five senses are used in a growing community. His five senses were: Sense of Place, Sense of Community, Senses of Evolution, Sense of Ownership, and Sense of Diversity. Staff believe that the tribes will really like Sense of Place because they relate to places that are really important to them. Mr. Riptima also discussed the economics of preservation as part of smart growth, affordable housing, and tourism.

Mr. Garrison stated that SHPO staff will meet with the partners and others to see how heritage tourism might be developed economically.

Mr. Garrison noted SHPO staff were very happy and comfortable with the support of the agency in everything they tried to do for this conference. Agency staff who attended the conference were happy with it.

Ms. Stewart stated she attended most of the conference and felt it was superb in every way. The staff ran things smoothly. When twice as many people showed up as were expected, staff handled it well. The speakers were wonderful. There was a lot of information. Several sessions talked about the value of historic tourism. There were some interesting statistics about people going to Florida for historic places more so than for attractions such as Disney World. This is something that can be applied to our historic parks. She hoped the information would be available in time for the visioning meeting. She believes the Board needs to rethink the historic parks and the value they bring to the system. There was a lot of information on the greater return on the dollars invested in those types of parks. She complimented the SHPO on the conference – it was tremendous. Her only complaint was that she couldn't attend all the things that she wanted to. She got value out of everything she went to. She was also impressed with the diversity in the backgrounds of the people both attending and presenting. Some of the historic Park Managers were able to attend. Perhaps more staff from historic parks can attend in the future.

Mr. Travous stated that it would be nice to get the History Convention and this group together in one and create some critical mass.

Mr. Porter stated that he had had the same thought.

Ms. Stewart stated she had felt it was too bad there weren't more people who attend the History Convention at the conference.

Mr. Porter stated it is a wonderful idea. In reality that is perhaps where things are headed. The History Convention planners have a committee that specifically evaluates everywhere in Arizona that can handle a 500+/- person meeting. Their numbers are edging up there. They expect 350 or more in Safford next April. There are not a lot of places that can handle that many people. They would certainly like to draw SHPO more into their convention family as well. SHPO needs to be at the next convention. They will give SHPO a proper setting to make a pitch for future conferences to let those people who may not know about it have a more direct tap into it. He asked to be advised when the next conference will be held as quickly as possible so that the information can be placed on the convention's website.

Ms. Stewart stated that another thing that struck her was that a lot of the same issues came up in historic preservation as occur in preservation of open space. That may be another group of people who would be interested in the conference. Many times people who are interested in preserving natural resources are also interested in preserving cultural and historic resources.

Mr. Garrison responded that Spur Cross Ranch was put out as an archaeological site.

Ms. Stewart suggested trying to tap into some of those mailing lists. This is an area where people tend to think that if just land and open space or just old buildings are preserved economic opportunities are lost. Yet there is information coming in on both areas that indicate that by preserving these areas and historic structures more money is actually brought in to the economy.

Chairman Pfister called for a recess at 11:34 a.m.

Chairman Pfister reconvened the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

H. PARKS

1. Section report

Mabery License Agreement

Mr. Ream reported this issue was discussed in Executive Session and that the Board wished to take action.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Parks Board instruct the Attorney General's Office to proceed along the lines the Board outlined in Executive Session.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Whetstone Springs

Chairman Pfister stated the Board wishes to continue its existing activities on this issue.

Report on Tonto Natural Bridge State Park

Mr. Ream introduced Mr. John Boeck, Park Manager at Tonto Natural Bridge State Park. Mr. Boeck is in his 26th year with ASP. He has known Mr. Boeck a long time; he has worked for Mr. Boeck, and was trained by Mr. Boeck. There is almost nothing in ASP that Mr. Boeck has not done. He has managed recreational parks, historic parks, and conservation parks, including Tonto and Slide Rock State Park. He is a general instructor in law enforcement as well as firearms instructor and self-defense instructor.

Mr. Boeck stated he appreciated this opportunity to stand before the Board and talk about something that is dear to his heart – Tonto Natural Bridge State Park (Tonto). He thanked Ms. Barbie Hart for putting together the slide show presentation.

Mr. Boeck reported that Tonto is located off Highway 87, 10 miles north of Payson, in the western edge of the Arizona Rim Country. People usually come to the park from Phoenix via Highway 87. Many visitors who come to the park from the western side of Phoenix come up I-17 through Camp Verde and Pine. From Highway 87, visitors travel west 2.7 miles on Forest Service Road 583. ASP may need to come up with a name for this road because the Forest Service wants to put names for home delivery.

Mr. Boeck stated the purpose of the park is the preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the bridge, to promote the ecological balance of the surrounding lands, and to maintain the integrity of the historical value of the property as well as providing public access for the education and benefit of the people.

Mr. Boeck reported Tonto became the 26th state park on October 12, 1990. He had the privilege on that day of taking possession of the property for ASP and ensuring that the people who lived here did not remove anything that should not have been removed. Senate Bill 1030 appropriated the allowance for ASP to enter into the lease agreement to purchase the property. It also established the Tonto Enterprise Fund whereby all funds generated from the use of the Lodge go for repairs and maintenance of the structure.

Mr. Boeck reported that the Tonto Natural Bridge is the largest known travertine bridge in the world. The history of the discovery of the property is colorful. There is an abundance of animal life on the park. The park is the only access to Pine Creek, a stream-fed creek.

Mr. Boeck reported that when Tonto was a privately-owned park their visitation was about 45,000 visitors per year. In its first year as a state park, visitation at Tonto was 85,000. The park is a two-hour drive from the Phoenix metropolitan area in the cooler Rim Country. It provides the opportunity for people to come up for day trips and family outings. Activities at the park consist mostly of hiking and swimming north and downstream of the bridge.

Mr. Boeck reported that, according to surveys taken at the park, most people come to the park because they like the community and want to have a nice, passive recreational experience.

Mr. Boeck reported that natural features at the park include the natural bridge (the only one of its kind in the state), several springs, and four trails. He noted that after acquiring the park staff were set to open the park by Memorial Day. At that time the road down to the Lodge had to be rebuilt with guardrails added, a trail was added at the bottom, the observation deck was built, a footbridge was built at the bottom, and a parking lot was established. They had help from the Phoenix Office and all the other parks. That's what's good about this agency – we're always willing to help out wherever needed.

Mr. Boeck added that the park also has viewpoints, one of which allows handicapped access to view the bridge from the parking lot. Three of the four viewpoints permit viewing of the natural bridge and one a geological formation.

Mr. Boeck reported that facilities at the park include the contact station, a lodge with a gift shop, and parking for 135 vehicles. There are 8 portable toilets and 4 picnic ramadas (1 group and 3 individual). There are 5 historic structures in the park. The building that serves as the office was built in 1910 and renovated by park staff and Construction Services. One of the historic cabins remains.

Mr. Boeck reported the entrance fee to the park is \$6 per vehicle with up to four adults (14 years and older). Additional passengers are charged \$1. There are some areas that are for group use or Special Use Permit. The group ramada can be reserved for \$100 for a group of up to 50 people (plus the entry fee). The Lodge can be rented and accommodates up to 20 people at a charge of \$50 per person per night. The Lodge can also be rented during the day at a cost of \$200. There is an area that can be used for weddings throughout the year, with a limit of 100 people so that the public can still use the park. The fee is \$100 for up to 50 people and \$200 for 51-100 people plus the entry fee.

Mr. Boeck added that the new barbecues will allow those renting the facility to be able to barbecue outdoors year round.

Mr. Boeck reported there are two Ranger residences on the park. They are the first two homes built by ASP in the park and are occupied by the Park Manager and Assistant Park Manager. They are very nice homes.

Mr. Boeck reported there are two trailers that were left by the previous owners. One is used as a volunteer meeting room and the other is used as an employee break room. There is a shop building that was completed in 1996. It is a two-car garage, prefab kit that was put up by an outside contractor. There are two septic systems on the park. One, (1,000 gallons) is for the Lodge and is inadequate. There is a 1,500-gallon system for the park home. The water system is a simple spring box. Water storage is about 200 gallons. There is also a cement pond on the park. It is a historic pool that was built in the 1930s. Water enters through the top from the spring and exits from the bottom. It is currently being used mainly for fire suppression.

Ms. Stewart asked if the park is responsible for its own fire protection.

Mr. Boeck responded that the park is in the Pine/Strawberry Fire District. If there's a fire at the park they are called and the Forest Service comes as well.

Mr. Boeck discussed the interpretive philosophy of the natural bridge – You can read deep in a man's heart only if you do as he did and see as he saw. This was written year ago and really pertains to this park. The park was developed to allow people to see what the discoverer of the bridge first saw. There are both developed and undeveloped trails on this park. The undeveloped trails provide the same access but with a feeling of adventure. People really enjoy that feeling at this park. The interpretive philosophy helps not just the park, but it also builds relationships between the visitors and the park staff. It also helps develop an understanding of how important these resources are in the park areas. It demonstrates the understanding of those relationships between the history and the botany and the geology of the park. It shows the delicacy of the natural environment and how careful we need to be in protecting it and how misuse or overuse can hurt the resources. It provides inspiration and relaxation. It helps people appreciate and respect their outdoors and their resources. It also shares accurate and interesting information.

Mr. Boeck reported there are a number of programs, including a geology talk at the bridge and guided tours at the viewpoints that includes a geology/history/botany talk. These are provided by volunteers. Staff do provide programs from time to time. There is no charge for any of the interpretive programs. Most are by reservation only except for the geology talk at the bridge.

Mr. Boeck then discussed marketing. There is a lot of advertising in newspapers. At least once a year *The Mesa Tribune* and *The Arizona Republic* have an article on the park. Every two or three years *Arizona Highways* has an article, in fact there will be an article on Tonto in September. A lot of their advertising is by word-of-mouth.

Mr. Boeck stated the marketing plan includes increasing park revenues, increasing park awareness, assisting in allocating appropriate marketing plans, and supporting and promoting the natural environment.

Mr. Boeck added that partnerships include the Rim Country Chamber of Commerce and the Gila County Redevelopment Corporation.

Mr. Boeck reported that staffing levels include the Park Manager, Assistant Park Manager, and two Park Ranger II positions (one for maintenance and one takes care of the volunteer program, the interpretive program, and works the gift shop and contact

station). There are two temporary Park Ranger I positions. There are about 20 volunteers who actively volunteer at the park.

Mr. Boeck reported that attendance for 2000-2001 was 101,291; revenue was \$166,425; gift shop revenue was \$72,417. Last year's numbers were down significantly due primarily to the Chediski Fire and closure of Tonto National Forest (people thought the park was closed). This year has been a lot better. The fires have been put out, Research and Marketing have been working on advertising, and people are visiting the area and staying over.

Mr. Boeck reported the Operating Budget is \$41,000 per year.

Mr. Boeck stated concerns include overuse of the natural resource, removing too much water from the spring, introduction of new septic systems, drainage, road traffic (staff must maintain the road, including plowing when it snows), employee safety, having someone monitor the bridge, fire, bark beetle infestation to the Pinion Pines and Cypress trees, and the drought.

Ms. Stewart asked if any studies have been conducted on the impact of having cabins in the park or renting out rooms at the Lodge.

Mr. Boeck responded that park staff are preparing to test a new well that is far enough away that it will not affect springs. Any decisions on larger septic systems will wait until the new well is tested. A decision may need to be made to complete the Lodge before adding restrooms to the park.

Mr. Boeck reported that Capital projects include remodeling the historic Lodge, site utilities well, site utility amenities, log cabins, and restroom/showers.

Mr. Boeck reported the Vision is to increase the gift shop sales, increase interpretive programs, increase the volunteer program, and increase visitation and revenue, create a lodge concession, restore the historic flavor, increase group use opportunities, and increase park staff.

Mr. Boeck reported that short-term goals include to increase the park trails and perform maintenance on them, convert picnic tables, and establish a natural resource area in the canyon. The geologic formations are so amazing in this park, yet people don't even realize they are there.

Mr. Boeck discussed improvements that include adding two group use ramadas, additional parking to accommodate the large numbers who are turned away on weekends and holidays, two restroom facilities, and 12 rental cabins.

Mr. Boeck stated the long-term goal would be build-out the park

Ms. Stewart asked what types of wildlife are on the park that one might not expect to see.

Mr. Boeck responded there are a lot of deer, mountain lions, and bears.

Ms. Stewart asked how many acres ASP have and whether any of the Forest Land or State Trust Land in the area are managed by the agency.

Mr. Boeck responded the park is 160 acres and a small portion was purchased from the Forest Service where the park homes are.

Chairman Pfister suggested that, regarding the fee discussions, the costs for special events such as weddings appear to be extremely low and could be raised. The Phoenix Zoo charges \$4,000 to rent for a wedding. Weddings would be an added value and it is something that is clearly worth much more than \$100-\$200. She believes the current fees for such things are too low.

Ms. Stewart added that it might be possible to charge for special tours (not necessarily the tours under the bridge).

Mr. Boeck responded that Girl Scout Troops and Valley schools usually request the special tours.

Ms. Stewart suggested that those are groups the agency probably shouldn't charge for anyway.

Chairman Pfister and the Board thanked Mr. Boeck for his presentation.

Slide Rock/Sedona Fire District Update and Feasibility

Mr. Ream reported that the Sedona Fire District (Sedona FD) asked ASP to cooperate with them to place a fire station on 3 acres at Slide Rock State Park (Slide Rock). A second meeting was held with Sedona Fire District since their request. Staff are in the process of developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the three parties (ASP, Sedona FD, and the Forest Service) that will be brought before the Board in September or October. No one wants to move any further until everyone agrees that as the dominoes fall it could be a "go".

Chairman Pfister asked if the discussions are going well.

Mr. Ream responded the discussions are going well. Staff will put it on the table and see where it goes from there. Both the Forest Service and Sedona FD have to approve it, as well as the Parks Board.

Sonoita Creek

Mr. Ream reported that Escrow closed on 259 acres at Sonoita Creek on June 15. Implementation of the Cooperative Agreement Plan has commenced. Boundary signs are already being posted along the creek. Off road vehicles are being excluded. Money has been provided to hire a Park Ranger II or III.

Chairman Pfister explained that this is an 11-mile stretch of creek from Patagonia Lake up to the Santa Cruz River. It is an amazing place.

Mr. Ream added that Arizona Game and Fish Commission was awarded the \$750,000 Recovery Land Acquisition Grant from the US Fish and Wildlife Service. They will use that money to purchase the portion of Fresno Canyon they presented to the Board recently. Staff will work with Game and Fish to create a Cooperative Plan over it. This Fresno Canyon piece is just between ASP's two properties. Fresno Canyon is probably one of the most significant places ASP could not purchase.

Chairman Pfister asked if any progress has been made for a dedication ceremony.

Mr. Travous responded that it has been difficult to coordinate with the Governor's schedule. She may not be in the southern part of the state until the fall.

Verde River Greenway

Mr. Ream reported appraisals have been received for two pieces of the Verde River Greenway property from Phelps Dodge. The Board will have complete connectivity to the Greenway from the Tuzigoot Bridge to the park's bridge. There will be connectivity from the park's bridge to the bridge area the Board sold to the County.

Mr. Cordasco noted that Phelps Dodge has property there and asked if this property is part of a mitigation.

Mr. Ream responded that the agency had been working with Salt River Project (SRP) who must do a lot of rural flycatcher mitigation. Phelps Dodge, however, is not a mitigation partner at this time.

Ms. Stewart asked if Phelps Dodge has some additional lands that the agency is interested in near the park that are not on the water.

Mr. Ream responded affirmatively. There are some problems with some of the Phelps Dodge lands where they were abused in the past. One of the reasons Phelps Dodge owns them is that they have things on them that they don't really want to deal with. Staff are leery about those properties. They won't be developed.

Hopi MOU Update and Discussion of Draft MOU

Mr. Ream reported that staff have developed a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and have turned it over to the Hopi. Staff have not received their revisions yet. If staff receive those revisions prior to the September Board meeting, they will bring it to the Board and possibly have a ceremony of some sort in October.

Chairman Pfister noted that a Board conference call can always be arranged for that issue. Staff should not worry about waiting until the September Board meeting. An hour conference call would be sufficient to handle this issue.

Mr. Ream responded that once their revisions are received, staff's work is finished. It will be provided to the Board members for their revisions. Once those revisions are received, a redline version would be sent to the Board to refer to during that conference call.

Chairman Pfister noted this is regarding Homolovi State Park.

Chemehuevi Indian Tribe Interstate Ferry Proposal

Mr. Ream reported the Chemehuevi Tribe has approached staff regarding a ferry depot on BLM lands that the BLM knows ASP wants. This may be the catalyst that moves BLM to allow ASP acquisition of these two sections. While the purpose of this ferry is to transport gamblers to the Chemehuevi casino from Lake Havasu, they are 40 miles from Needles. Going from Lake Havasu to Needles by ferry is much closer for doctors' appointments, etc. A presentation will be made to the Board in either September or October. This is a very complex issue that will take some time to work out because it deals with the BLM, Native Americans, and interstate commerce (two states involved).

Mr. Ream requested the Board move on to the Board Action item before discussing KCCP.

2. Board Actions:

- a. Arizona State Parks Capital Improvement – Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006 -**
Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks Board approve the Arizona State Parks Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006 as presented.

Mr. Ream reported this information was included in the Board Packet and is the plan for FY 2005 and 2006. This document is a measure for locking in these funds. There is more than \$4 million in Enhancement Fund money that the agency will not get. However, it must be programmed out. There is also \$2 million in SLIF funding that the agency also will not receive.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Parks Board approve the Arizona State Parks Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006 as presented.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion.

Ms. Stewart noted that several months ago the Board talked about doing some revenue-generating things at the parks such as installing telescopes, cabins, laundries, etc. She noticed that it will cost \$17,500 in improvements for the laundries. She asked how that investment would be recouped.

(At this point, Chairman Pfister left the meeting and Vice Chairman Hays took possession of the gavel.)

Mr. Ream responded that there have been coin-operated laundries on the park in the past. They do create some problems. Capital money within state parks does not necessarily need to be recouped. The reason for things like this is to keep people on the parks longer and use the park's facilities. They can make thousands of dollars a week. It is not the highest priority on the Project 11 list. These suggestions came from the field as to what people were looking for while they are staying in the parks. A few trials will probably be done before building all of those laundries.

Ms. Stewart asked if staff have any concern about the environmental impact of the soap, etc.

Mr. Ream responded it does need study. The septic systems at some parks can handle it; other places might require upgrading of the septic systems and be cost-prohibitive. Some parks are on city sewers.

Vice Chairman Hays called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion carried with a vote of 4 Ayes and 0 Nays (Chairman Pfister being temporarily away from the meeting).

Kartchner Caverns State Park Big Room Opening Plan

Mr. Ream stated that Mr. Ziemann is leading the KCCP Big Room Opening Plan and Mr. Travous has been working closely with the Friends of Kartchner Caverns State Park (Friends) on this plan.

Mr. Travous reported that staff anticipate the Grand Opening of the Big Room to be November 7, 8, and 9 (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday). He noted that November 10 is a Monday and the 11th is Veterans Day, a holiday.

At this point Chairman Pfister returned to the meeting and regained the gavel.

Ms. Stewart noted that it could actually turn into five days.

Mr. Travous responded that a few things might have changed. November 7 is the early Media Day where staff would literally begin at 4:00 a.m. *Good Morning America* staff were at the park at 4:00 a.m. during the Throne/Rotunda Grand Opening sending live feeds back to New York for their show. The morning will be spent with the media. That afternoon staff hoped to have the Governor and her entourage come in for the political side of the Grand Opening. Staff were informed a day or so ago that it does not appear that the Governor can be at KCSP on November 7th. If she is available on November 6th she could help open it on that day. That does not create any problems. It would just mean moving things up one day.

Ms. Stewart asked if the Board should tentatively pencil those dates in on their calendars.

Mr. Travous requested that the Board members pencil November 6th through 9th for the Grand Opening. They will not need to be there all four days. The most important day for the Board members to be there would be the day the Governor is there. Staff would like to have the Board Members, their guests, the Friends and their guests, some legislators, and some local politicians at the park when Governor and her staff are there.

Mr. Travous asked that the Board assume everything will begin on November 7th. In addition to the activities he just discussed for the early morning and morning, the Friends plan to have the Young Presidents Club come in the evening as a fundraiser.

Mr. Travous stated that for November 8th and 9th, there would be 250 people per day coming in as perhaps a fundraiser with the Arizona Diamondbacks Charities.

Ms. Stewart asked how this will work in terms of revenue for ASP.

Mr. Travous responded that he'd like to give the schedule staff are looking at. Staff plan to announce these dates in August. In August and September preparations for tours will commence. Staff anticipate the bats will leave the cave by mid-September. A list of what needs to be accomplished between now and the opening was distributed to the Board.

Mr. Travous stated that practice tours can commence in mid-October.

Mr. Ream stated that the practice tours will begin October 20 and run through November 3 excluding weekends.

Mr. Travous noted that for the first opening there were a few practice tours the first day, then staff backed off to see how things went, then added a tour, backed off, and increased the numbers of tours coming in until staff felt they were up-to-speed. For the last opening, people were simply invited to go on practice tours. For this opening, that opportunity has been given to the Friends. "Practice Tour" tickets have been given to the Friends. They will go out and get donations for these tours. At the end of the day those people will be asked to complete questionnaires to see what they liked, didn't like, length of time, etc. It will be about a month of feedback in that process. Friends anticipate raising a lot of money for the next year. This will be their last opportunity for fund raising.

Chairman Pfister asked that Friends put the Board members on their E-mail network in case the Board want to buy some of those tickets.

Mr. Travous responded that Friends have a variety of ways to distribute these tickets. For example, each tour includes 15 people. KUAT (Tucson) has already committed to buying 45 tickets (3 tours). KUAT will probably sell them for \$100. Mr. John Whiteman is now heading the Friends group. They are making a real effort to ensure that the money comes back into the park and can do things ASP cannot. He is very pleased with Mr. Whiteman's emphasis on that.

Mr. Travous stated that Friends has about 1200-1300 tickets. Staff have held back some tickets for things they need and want to do. Board members should let Mr. Whiteman know if they have a group of people (preferably 15 for a full tour) that they think they can get \$50 each from.

Ms. Stewart asked if the practice tour tickets are \$50 per person.

Mr. Travous responded \$50 is what Friends are hoping to get for each ticket. If, for example, a group of 15 people from the Superstition Mountain Hiking Club were willing to pay \$100 each to go on one of these tours, Friends would give them those tickets and would want \$50 per person back and the Hiking Club could keep the other \$50. The Friends are managing all of that.

Ms. Stewart asked if a group of individuals wanted to get together it would be \$50 each and if it is an organization that wants to have it as a fundraiser then they would charge \$100 each and keep the difference.

Mr. Travous responded affirmatively and added that Friends would appreciate the tickets being sold in groups of 15 so that they don't have to sell them one at a time.

Mr. Travous added that staff are going to try to set aside some tickets on the last days for various Advisory Groups who have worked with the Board over the years. It will be a way to thank them for their efforts over the years.

Chairman Pfister noted that the Board has not really done anything for the five Advisory Groups.

Mr. Travous stated that staff are going to try to keep this much more simple and less expensive than the first Grand Opening. The first Grand Opening cost between \$600,000 and \$700,000. It was amazing what was done, and yet Friends raised the money to do it. In retrospect, the money was spent on the event. Friends want to be sure they are sustainable on through the coming years to assist the park in doing things ASP can't do for the park.

Ms. Stewart noted that, regardless, the Friends will be a reflection on the agency. People don't really understand the difference between what they are doing and what the agency does sometimes.

Mr. Travous stated that Friends wants to do a "Friend Raiser" with the Presidents Club and then on Saturday and Sunday they would like to do another dinner to try to get more people from the Phoenix community involved. Mr. Whiteman is now retired from Empire Machinery and is spending a lot of his personal time doing those kinds of things. He has been very helpful to the agency.

Mr. Travous added that the Governor's inability to be at the park on November 7th has thrown this schedule into a spin. If she can be there on November 6th, the whole event may be either moved up a day or add a day onto it.

Mr. Travous stated that another goal is to try to get as many 6th grade students to the park as early as possible. In the statewide school system the 6th grade is where geology is taught. Staff are trying to figure out a way to have a preponderance of 6th graders from Cochise County be the first people in. It is good public relations for the agency; the media loves it; it is a market that can be sold. If they cannot all come at once, staff are trying to figure out how to raise money so that each 6th grader in Cochise County can be given a ticket and then they can just make a reservation with their parents.

Mr. Travous stated that on Monday, November 10, the park would be closed down. At the last opening, the staff were given the day after the opening events off to decompress and spruce up the park to get ready for the onslaught. Staff anticipate a flood of calls when the phone lines are opened up for the Big Room Tours and that reservations will be sold for months and months in advance.

Ms. Stewart asked when reservations will be taken for the Big Room tours.

Mr. Ream responded that staff are planning to launch on August 4.

Mr. Siegwarth stated that he would like to bump that date back a day or two.

Mr. Ream noted that August 4 is the first Monday in August. That's why it was chosen as the target date. Again, staff are still in the planning stages. Technically, staff are gearing up for August 4. If something gets in the way, the date can be changed.

Mr. Ziemann reported that as staff began to plan this Grand Opening they found that the first day is somewhat routine (the media come, the Governor is invited, etc.). To some degree it is restricted by protocol. Staff struggled to some degree as to what to do with Saturday and Sunday. There was discussion about the 6th graders. However, it is a weekend. It's virtually impossible to get groups of 6th graders and their teachers to show up on a Saturday or Sunday, especially when it's so close to a holiday.

Mr. Ziemann stated that he approached the Arizona Diamondback Charities. A relationship exists with the Diamondbacks. There are 250 slots available per day for Saturday and Sunday. Those slots could be given to the Diamondback Charities who could then raise money by donations, sales, silent auctions, etc. The Diamondbacks have some reservations and concerns. That is when they have a lot of their big events and they would be pushing them in September. They would receive 500 slots. In return, ASP would receive access to the ballpark, the publicity of their announcers talking about ASP every night. ASP would be able to get publicity and notoriety in ways that would otherwise never happen.

Ms. Stewart asked if pictures could be shown on their screens.

Mr. Ziemann responded that he thought they would be very willing to work with staff.

Chairman Pfister suggested hawking it in Tucson with the Triple A. That is another huge market as well and it would be very easy for them to do it in Tucson as well.

Mr. Ziemann added that the Grand Opening could be announced as "Arizona State Parks, Friends of Kartchner Caverns State Park, and Arizona Diamondbacks Charities

Announce The Grand Opening of Kartchner Caverns State Park". It would be done hand-in-hand with them utilizing their ability to draw media attention. They would announce that the reservation line is open as well as the existence of the 500 tickets through Arizona Diamondbacks Charities.

Ms. Stewart asked where the money from the 500 tickets would go – to the Diamondbacks Charities or would a portion come back to help compensate for the loss in revenue.

Mr. Ziemann responded that staff never planned to generate any revenue from the Grand Opening. Far more will be gained from the publicity that the Diamondbacks can generate than could ever be made from selling \$12-\$15 per ticket going in.

Mr. Ream noted the Diamondbacks had a 23 share during their June run. That is huge. Chairman Pfister added that it is a potential for national media exposure.

Mr. Ziemann added that there is debate about a percentage to give back to Friends. Considering the Diamondbacks' reputation, staff want to ensure this is enticing enough for them so that they are excited about it and are willing to go through with it.

Mr. Ziemann noted he believes they are concerned that Mr. Colangelo and the team's stars will all be required to show up at the park and be there for four days. Staff do not have those needs or demands of them.

Mr. Ziemann added that people are far more likely to give money to a non-profit organization. Friends will benefit because they will be a part of the announcement and have access to the ballpark. Friends will be at the park the nights these 500 people (whom they have not had access to) show up. One of the problems Friends has is that they have continuously "hit up" the same group of people over and over again. They need some new prospects.

Mr. Travous added that Friends do have a concern as to whether they will be able to sell all of the tickets they have been given. The next couple of weeks will tell how well they will be able to sell those 1200 tickets.

Chairman Pfister noted that she knows of a couple of groups that might buy tours. She will contact them.

Ms. Stewart commented that she assumed that people on the practice tours will not be permitted to take pictures.

Mr. Travous responded affirmatively.

Mr. Ziemann added that the Saturday and Sunday tours would not be ranger-led tours. Basically, the lights will be turned on and park staff will be stationed around the cave. Essentially, those who buy those tickets will be among the first to have access to the cave and will be permitted to take photographs so long as they are not for commercial use. They will not be tours.

Mr. Ream noted that there are so many unknown things that may happen. The lights have never been turned off for four months. Staff are not exactly sure what will happen when the bats leave and lights are turned on again. It will be 5-10 days before practice

tours begin so staff can go through and fix things. Mr. Florentine will return to the cave around September 13.

Chairman Pfister noted that, between now and September, it might be helpful if staff would send E-mail updates to the Board as things evolve. Again, the Board can schedule a conference call if there is a need to run something.

Mr. Ream added that, in addition to the lights, 16 new employees will be hired, for a total of 57 employees at KCSP. There are more employees at that one park than in the Central Region. Hiring 16 new employees, getting them trained on the old tour so the current tour guides can work on the new tours is a big shift for park staff.

Ms. Stewart asked if reintroduction time has been scheduled for the tour guides since it will have been several months since they have done that particular tour.

Mr. Ream responded that it was at the very last minutes that those tours were done. There will be two weeks of training before they would go back into the cave. Many of these employees have been doing tours for three years.

Mr. Travous added that Friends will try to defray travel costs for some of the staff at Frassassi (in Italy) to come to the Grand Opening.

Mr. Ream reported there have been a number of problems with children inside the cave – particularly those under six. They don't like it in the cave (dark, clammy, low oxygen levels, etc.). Some do fine; some don't. They all are somewhat difficult to control. It's not so much of a problem in The Throne Room or The Rotunda Room because they are at a distance from all of the features. In The Big Room, however, people will need to "duck" as they move around. That tour is longer; it is more physically demanding. Staff are looking at the prospect of not allowing children under six into The Big Room. This is not a decision staff can make on their own.

Chairman Pfister suggested that the Board's position can be that it is for the safety of the children.

Ms. Stewart added that it is also to protect the resource. If someone is carrying a child, it is a lot harder to "duck" and get around formations. The Board's first obligation is protection of the resource; its second obligation is to make the tour enjoyable and comfortable for those people on the tour.

Chairman Pfister stated that she is comfortable with this so long as people have the ability to take their young children on the other tour.

Mr. Ream responded that Disneyland requires that children be a certain height before they can ride some of their rides and they still make a lot of money.

Mr. Porter stated that he felt this is something that the Board should take action on. Having taken the tour, he is in complete agreement that there should be that control.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that, for the interest of safety and preservation of the resource, the Parks Board limit The Big Room Tours at Kartchner Caverns State Park to individuals who are at least six years of age.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ream stated that he will contact the Board if the fallout is too bad.

Chairman Pfister stated that the Board can say it wants to do this for at least the first year. If, after the tours have gotten going, it appears that it can be expanded, then the Board can do so. With the protection of the resource as the Board's fundamental obligation, it becomes a combination of visitor experience and protection of the resource.

Ms. Stewart noted that, in conjunction with the original planned opening of The Big Room, the Board is scheduled to be in Benson in October. She asked if the Board still wanted to meet in Benson in October and then go down again three weeks later for the opening.

Mr. Ream responded that that is certainly the Board's discretion. He believes that the pre-visit in October would be helpful for the Board to see how things are coming on the tours. The Grand Opening in November does not really coincide with a Board meeting. The October Board meeting would be a great opportunity for the Board and staff to see what's going on before the practice tours begin. Then the Grand Opening can be all pleasure with little business.

J. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Chairman Pfister noted that there has been discussion throughout this meeting about having a vision meeting. Because the next two meetings will be very full, she requested it be scheduled as a part of the November meeting in Phoenix.

Mr. Porter requested that it be conducted somewhere other than Phoenix.

Ms. Stewart suggested it could be done somewhere in Phoenix other than at the Phoenix Office.

Mr. Porter stated he felt the Board is looking for a comfortable setting where they can really kick back and give it the serious consideration and attention it needs.

K. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Chairman Pfister stated the next Board meeting will be on Thursday, September 18 in Scottsdale. It will be a long meeting because there is money to award in grants. Staff is working to secure a meeting place in Scottsdale.

Chairman Pfister noted that viewing of the film "Sense of Place" is available for those who wish to view it. She would not be able to stay due to a need to return to Phoenix. She noted most of the Board members have seen the film. Those who did not and wished to can get a copy from staff to view.

M. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Porter made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a

Arizona State Parks Board Minutes
July 17, 2003

sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

APPROVED

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

Suzanne Pfister, Chairman